

**From:** Lisa Pierce [lpierce01@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Tuesday, September 19, 2006 6:28 AM  
**To:** Leto, Sam [LEGIS]  
**Subject:** FW: legislature Sept. '06

**Attachments:** LegisoversightSept.\_06.doc

Mr. Leto,

Attached you will find Director Jan Meisenbachs comments and concerns to present to the Government Oversight Committee. Some of my additional concerns would include.

#1 The initial contract RFP that was issued last November 2005 and the results awarded in March of 2006 was rescinded. I am presuming due to the Central Iowa Gambling Treatment Programs appeal. When the contract was rescinded that cancelled out our appeal and we resubmitted for contract funds in under a new request for proposal issued in April of 2006 and was due in June 2006. Notification of awards was sent out in August 21st of 2006 and the CIGTP inc. was awarded both area 7 our current area and area 10. Through this appeal process and resubmission of a new RFP the CIGTP was never notified if any of the previous concerns identified in the initial appeal were addressed, nor are we eligible for reimbursement of any of the expenses that were accrued through the appeal process or the time and monies spent reapplying for the contract. I do not believe that the program should have to suffer monetary losses due to IDPH's wrong doings.

#2 The new contracts are to begin on October 1st 2006. The CIGTP inc. has not received any form of a contract for area 10, the new area and we are needing to order supplies, hire and train more staff, secure our satellite locations and set up new phone lines by October 1st. This makes me alittle uneasy to spend these monies when we have not received our contract for area 10.

#3 We did receive a contract for area 7, our current location. This was e-mailed to me on 9-14-06. In this new contract there were 17 additional conditions. The one that is most upsetting is related to specifically cutting the CIGTP's educational funding by 46%. I do not agree with this and e-mailed Janet Zwick back explaining my concerns on several of these areas and have yet to receive a response. We submitted our RFP's , received the award letter and then still have additional things added at the last meeting. I struggle anyway with IDPH mandating that 75 % of our outreach and educational presentations need to be in classroom style vs booths at our local casinos, county fairs and community events. It is apparent that what we are doing is working as our program serves by for the largest # of individuals.

#4 The CIGTP inc. was denied a additional amendment requesting more funds due to the client demand for the extension period of our contract of July through September

2006 due to Ms. Zwick stating that she was unsure if the funds would be available. What happened to the 1.5 million carryover in 2005 and the 1 million carryover from 2006?

#5 I would also like to object to the bidding process implemented in these RFP's. We were asked to bid what the programs could provide each service for in dollar amounts. I feel that this is unfair. It means that those who can manage their funds better or choose to take on more than one role in the company will receive less funding for the same service provided.

Thank you for taking the time to read this.

Lisa Pierce

Director  
Central Iowa Gambling Treatment Program Inc.  
2255 73rd Street  
Windsor Heights, IA 50322  
515-309-0380  
515-309-0385 Fax

Eastern Iowa Center For Problem Gambling, Inc.  
216 West Third Street Davenport, Iowa 52801 563-322-2535

Please submit the following concerns and follow up suggestions to and for the Government Oversight Committee members concerning the Gambling Treatment Program on behalf of EICFPG, Inc.

Most currently, EICFPG, Inc. has twice, in 2006, been denied the Transitional Housing contract and funding for eastern Iowa. As the only entity who submitted a proposal each time, my concerns are multiple;

1. Oversight committee notes dated September 20, 2005 indicate a need for stated services and that “ members suggest a more proactive effort than the RFP process “. Also stated was “ a subcommittee will be established to monitor this area”.

Q. Has such a committee been established and if so who are the members? And how can I access their input?

\*\*I have appealed the initial denial of transitional housing contract and plan to appeal the second denial. Hearing is set for late October 2006

Q. If IDPH is truly interested in the eastern region of Iowa providing such housing, why was it denied when only one entity was pursuing the contract?

Q. What will happen to the proposed 132,000.00 appropriated for that contract?

I would be most interested in providing a copy of the Transitional Housing RFP contract and discussing discrepancies found throughout the conditions and scoring process.

Other concerns I would like to voice on behalf of the gambling treatment program are;

1. Currently, this provider has not seen a budget for FY 2007, which begins Oct. 1, 2006 (late start to FY due to recinding and re-application of all proposals)
2. No signed contracts to date with IDPH
3. No carry-over per IDPH, yet 100,000. was available in Spring '06
4. In FY 2005, IDPH was questioned regarding 1.5 million carry-over. To date there is nothing in writing explaining where those gambling funds were dispersed.

Q. In September 20, 2005, the oversight committee requested additional information from the department as to the funding: Has IDPH been held accountable for those funds and where did they go?

Q. Since those funds were from FY 2005, and an additional 1 million carry-over from FY 2006 should be available, where is the dispersement ? (to date, current program(s) are being denied reimbursement for services already provided due to lack of funds.)

Another concern is that with the expansion of licenses for gambling in Iowa and a cap placed on gambling treatment funding, if and when needed, does the possiblilty exist to request increased capping. (Keep in mind that a 6 million dollar cap for GTP is in actuality 4.3 remaining for services after 1.690,000. is dispersed to substance abuse programs.) A provider will assumably expand it's locations, staffing and overhead requirements with growth of gambling venues, but has been no increased funding

available to contract budgets. Additionally, there has never been a release of information regarding funds deposited into the gambling treatment fund from those individuals who voluntarily excluded themselves from casino venues. Have there never been such deposits?

My fear is that gambling treatment programs who which to expand to meet and improve the need of services, with gambling expansion, cannot. The GTP will remain stagnant with 4.3 million for services and the inability to grow to meet the needs of Iowans.

Only with the assistance of the Government Oversight Committee members can services and adequate funding for gambling treatment truly become available for Iowa residents.

Respectfully,

Janet R. Meisenbach, Director  
EICFPG, Inc.